

An attempt to resolve apparent paradoxes in definitions of Grassmann numbers and spinor fields

Roman Sverdlov
Raman Research Institute,
C.V. Raman Avenue, Sadashivanagar, Bangalore - 560080, India

August 18, 2008

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is two-fold: first, Grassmann numbers are defined outside of path integral, and secondly spinor degrees of freedom are defined as a variation of vierbines along space-filling curve.

1. Introduction While there are no physically observable paradoxes associated with that, the fermions are known for a very counter-intuitive way in which they are defined. First of all, one has to get used to the fact that Grassmann numbers are only defined inside of an integral. Secondly, as a result of mismatch between Lorentzian group and its spinor representation, one has to get used to "preferred" direction through which "spin up" is defined (which is usually z direction).

In this paper an attempt is being made to get around both of the problems. In the first half of the paper it will be shown that Grassmann numbers can be defined as elements of vector space supplied with both commuting dot and anticommuting wedge product as well as a measure ξ with both positive and negative values. In case of two variables, that integral takes the form

$$\int d\theta_1 d\theta_2 f(\theta_1, \theta_2) \rightarrow \int d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \xi(\theta_1) \xi(\theta_2) (\hat{\theta}_1 \wedge \hat{\theta}_2) \cdot \vec{f}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \quad (1)$$

Then in the second half of a paper the symmetry issue will be addressed by effectively replacing spinor field with vierbines themselves. This is done by envisioning a "space filling curve" and constructing a coordinate transformation between sets of vierbines on neighboring points of space-filling curve. This Lorentzian transformation is then associated with spinor rotation in a usual way. Finally, a spinor is introduced whose only non-zero components are real spin-up particle and real spin-up antiparticle ones (which are viewed as two independent real scalar fields); then the above spinor rotation is applied, which generates the rest of the spinor degrees of freedom.

It has to be mentioned that the first part of the paper (the one involving definition of Grassmann numbers) was already done in [2]. In this paper it was improved compared to [2] in that in this version more care was put towards defining the derivatives in Grassmann space. Another difference is that a short paragraph was written where a relationship between ordering in Grassmann integral and space filling curve was mentioned. Nevertheless it is safe to say that probably three quarters of the first part of this paper are the same as the corresponding part of previous one, and a lot was simply copied over.

However, the second part of the paper has far more radical differences. While in [2] the two sets of vierbines were generated through Gramm Schmidt process, in this paper they were simply taken from the nearby points of the space-filling curve, without any further tempering. This change is motivated by the fact that the choice of a particular way in which Gramm Schmidt process is done in [2] is very unnatural and thus ruins the beauty of the theory. On the other hand, the existence of space-filling curve is demanded by the definition of Grassmann numbers themselves (namely, the total ordering of the set is postulated in defining wedge products), thus no further complication is made by using that curve for other purposes as well.

2. Literal Interpretation of Grassmann Numbers outside of path integral

The goal of this section is to define Grassmann numbers in such a way that they make sense outside of integration, thus resolve the apparent paradox that comes with them. However, this specific section has heavily borrowing material from [2]; an important exception being the definition of derivative on p.4. So those who have already read [2] can safely skip to the next section.

The set of Grassman numbers is defined as a vector space equipped both with commuting dot product $(\cdot)$, anticommuting wedge product $(\wedge)$, and measure ξ . The integral is given in a form

$$\int (\vec{d}_\xi \theta_1 \wedge \vec{d}_\xi \theta_2 \dots \wedge \vec{d}_\xi \theta_n) \cdot \vec{F}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) , \quad (2)$$

where $\vec{d}_\xi \theta_k = \xi(\theta_k) \hat{\theta}_k d\theta_k$, $\xi(\theta_k)$ is a measure with both positive and negative values, and $\hat{\theta}_k$ is unit vector in the θ_k direction; finally $\vec{\theta}_k = \theta_k \hat{\theta}_k$.

As is true in ordinary analysis, the above definition of integral is expected to be independent on our ability to write the function in algebraic form.

If we define ξ in such a way that

$$\int \xi(x) dx = 0 ; \quad \int x \xi(x) dx = 1 \quad (3)$$

Then we will obtain

$$\int \vec{d}_\xi \theta \cdot \vec{\theta} = \hat{\theta} \cdot \hat{\theta} \quad (4)$$

$$\int \vec{d}_\xi \theta = 0 \quad (5)$$

Thus, if we postulate $\hat{\theta} \cdot \hat{\theta} = 1$ then both of the above equations will give us what we want. Now consider a multiple integral,

$$\int \vec{d}_\xi \theta_1 \cdot \left(\int \vec{d}_\xi \theta_2 \cdot (\vec{\theta}_1 \wedge \vec{\theta}_2) \right) \quad (6)$$

By using the ξ integrals we already know, this becomes $\hat{\theta}_1 \cdot (\hat{\theta}_2 \cdot (\hat{\theta}_1 \wedge \hat{\theta}_2))$. Thus, in order for the integral to give us what we expect, we would like to enforce

$$\hat{\theta}_1 \cdot (\hat{\theta}_2 \cdot (\hat{\theta}_1 \wedge \hat{\theta}_2)) = 1 \quad (7)$$

This can be accomplished by setting

$$\hat{\theta}_2 \cdot (\hat{\theta}_1 \wedge \hat{\theta}_2) = \hat{\theta}_1. \quad (8)$$

By a similar argument we can show that

$$(\hat{\theta}_2 \wedge \hat{\theta}_3) \cdot (\hat{\theta}_1 \wedge \hat{\theta}_2 \wedge \hat{\theta}_3) = \hat{\theta}_1 \quad (9)$$

and

$$\hat{\theta}_3 \cdot (\hat{\theta}_1 \wedge \hat{\theta}_2 \wedge \hat{\theta}_3) = \hat{\theta}_2 \wedge \hat{\theta}_3. \quad (10)$$

However, in light of commutativity of dot product and anticommutativity of wedge product this leads to apparent inconsistency:

$$\hat{\theta}_2 \cdot (\hat{\theta}_2 \wedge \hat{\theta}_1) = -\hat{\theta}_2 \cdot (\hat{\theta}_1 \wedge \hat{\theta}_2) = -\hat{\theta}_1. \quad (11)$$

The way I will handle it is by associating unit vectors with elements of totally ordered set, thus making a default decision between $\hat{\theta}_1 \wedge \hat{\theta}_2$ versus $\hat{\theta}_2 \wedge \hat{\theta}_1$.

While the definition of Grassmann integral is meant to be general and does not appeal to any physical situation, it is fruitful to ask ourselves, what kind of total ordering will we get when we do apply it to physics. The objects to which the total ordering applies to are $\hat{\psi}_i(x^\mu)$ where i runs from 1 through 8 and denotes 8 real degrees of freedom (or equivalently 4 complex degrees of freedom) of a spinor. We can define the total ordering on such set as follows. First, we define the total ordering on $\mathbb{R}^4$, which, intuitively, represents a curve that fills a spacetime (which means that it is free to go in forward, backward or in spacelike directions). We say that $x < y$ if that curve reaches point x before reaching point y (since the curve can go both forward and backward, this has no implication on the causal relations between x and y). Then we claim that if $x < y$, then $\hat{\psi}_i(x) < \hat{\psi}_j(y)$ regardless of values of i and j ; on the other hand, if $x = y$ then $\hat{\psi}_i(x) < \hat{\psi}_j(x)$ whenever $i < j$.

Needless to say, the above picture appeals to some form of discretization of space time. Thus, I can number them all: $\hat{\theta}_n = \hat{\psi}_{n-a(n)}(x_{n-a(n)})$, where $a(n)$ is the largest multiple of 8 that is less than n . This ordering will be selected in such a way that $\hat{\theta}_m < \hat{\theta}_n$ whenever $m < n$. It is important to remember that, while ψ has physical meaning, θ does not. A unit vector $\hat{\theta}_i$ is simply a constant that is not subject to any transformation laws. This part is crucial in order to understand the next section. The identification with spacetime spinors is only restored in the Lagrangian which happens to be a function of $\psi_{a(n)}(x^\mu(n - a(n)))\hat{\theta}_n$.

Going back to the general case, let's be a little more rigorous and define a polynomial

$$\vec{p} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_n \hat{\theta}_{a(i(1))} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\theta}_{a(i(n(k)))} \quad (12)$$

to be a function on $\mathbb{P}G$ (where G , which stands for Grassmann, is a set of unit vectors, while $\mathbb{P}$ stands for power set) such that $\vec{p}(\hat{\theta}_{a(i(1))}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{a(i(n(k)))}) = \pm c_n$ where $\pm$ corresponds to a sign of a permutation that is needed in order to arrange $\hat{\theta}_{a(i(1))}$ through $\hat{\theta}_{a(i(n(k)))}$ in the order corresponding to the total ordering.

It can be checked that the desired properties of Grassmann polynomials as well as their wedge and dot products can be obtained from the following definition:

Definition:

- a) A Grassmann polynomial is a function $\vec{f}: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$
- b) If $n \in G$, then $\hat{\theta}_n$ represents a Grassmann polynomial such that $\hat{\theta}_n(S)$ is 1 if $S = \{n\}$ and 0 otherwise
- c) If $\vec{p}_1$ and $\vec{p}_2$ are two Grassmann polynomials and c_1 and c_2 are two complex numbers, then $c_1\vec{p}_1 + c_2\vec{p}_2$ is a polynomial $\vec{q}$ satisfying $\vec{q}(S) = c_1\vec{p}_1(S) + c_2\vec{p}_2(S)$, for any $S \subset G$
- d) If $\vec{f}$ and $\vec{g}$ are two Grassmann polynomials, then $\vec{f} \wedge \vec{g}$ is another Grassmann polynomial such that for any $T \subset S$, $(\vec{f} \wedge \vec{g})(T) = \sum_{A \cup B = T} \vec{f}(A) \vec{g}(B) (-1)^{\#\{(a,b) | a \in A, b \in B, a > b\}}$.
- e) Let p_1 and p_2 be two polynomials over S . Then $p_1 \cdot p_2$ is another polynomial over S such that for every $T \subset S$,

$$(p_1 \cdot p_2)(T) = \sum_{(U \setminus V) \cup (V \setminus U) = T} p_1(U) p_2(V). \quad (13)$$

Finally we would like to define derivatives on Grassmann numbers. The functions of our interest take the form $\vec{f}(c_1\hat{\theta}_1, c_2\hat{\theta}_2, \dots)$. This can be rewritten as $\vec{f}(c_1\hat{\theta}_1 + c_2\hat{\theta}_2 + \dots)$. Thus, the argument of our function is a polynomial $\hat{p}$ which has non-zero values only for one-element sets. On the other hand, as evident from the example of exponential, its values do not have such restriction.

Since we would like the derivatives to anticommute, they represent the wedge-product form of ratio as opposed to dot-product one. Thus,

$$\vec{f}(\vec{p} + \delta\vec{\theta}_n) - \vec{f}(\vec{p}) \approx \delta\vec{\theta}_n \wedge \frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial \vec{\theta}_n} \quad (14)$$

Now, in order to avoid the unnecessary complications in defining absolute values of infinite polynomials, we simply define the notion of approximation in componentwise form. Thus, the definition of a derivative becomes

DEFINITION: We say that $\vec{D} = \frac{\partial \vec{f}}{\partial \vec{\theta}_n}|_{\vec{p}}$ if and only if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $\delta > 0$ such that for any positive $\rho < \delta$ and for any k , $|(\vec{f}(\vec{p} + \rho\hat{\theta}_n) - \vec{f}(\vec{p}) - \rho\hat{\theta}_n \wedge \vec{D})(\vec{\theta}_k)| < \epsilon\rho$.

3. Redefining Fermions

We would now like to adress a different part of a puzzle, namely how to define fermions in such a way that "spin up" direction doesn't look "special". This problem, of course, is bothersome in general. It becomes even more bothersome when ξ function is introduced to define Grassmann numbers, which singles out each of the spinor components, thus making us "take them seriously".

A toy model where fermions are non-Grassmannian was adresssed in [1]. According to that paper, we identify a spinor field at any point with a local reference frame, or a choice of vierbines, in which spin up particle and antiparticle components of the spinor are real, while spin down components are equal to 0. The spin-up particle and spin-up antiparticle components of the spinor are viewed as two independent real scalar fields. Thus, the total number of spinor degrees of freedom is equal to 6 rotation degrees of freedom plus two scalar ones, which is equal to 8. This matches the fact that ordinary spinor has 4 complex degrees of freedom and, therefore, 8 real ones.

This approach, however, can not be used once the fields are Grassmannian, since vierbines are not. For example, one can not impose ξ function on a set of vierbines without a severe violence to rotational invariance. Thus, in order to define fermions we need to be able to compare two sets of vierbines. The first set is real, while the "shift" of the second set relative to the first one is Grassmannian. However, if we were to actually introduce two sets of vierbines by hand, that would no longer be natural, and thus partly ruin the purpose of the paper.

To our rescue, we recall that we have already did some unnatural things in defining Grassmann numbers. So, perhaps, we can "use" one of the unnatural things that are already introduced in order to save ourselves from introducing more. One of such "unnatural" things is a definition of dot product in terms of a wedge product. We have assumed that the set of all elements is totally ordered in order to be able to say that $v_i \cdot v_j = v_i \wedge v_j$ whenever $i < j$. We can use that to immediately obtain the pairs of frames we would like to compare, namely the frames of "nearby" points according to that ordering, if the discreteness is assumed.

As was mentioned in the previous section, we can envision that total ordering is given by a curve $c^\mu(\tau)$ that "fills" the space-time (that curve can go in future, past or spacelike directions alike). We now discretize the curve, so that there are no values of parameter between τ and $\tau + \delta\tau$. The set of vierbines at x^μ can be represented as a tensor $E(x^\mu)$, where the component $E_{ab}(x^\mu)$ of the tensor is identified with b -component of vierbine $e_a(x^\mu)$. By setting $\delta E(\tau) = E(c^\mu(\tau + \delta\tau)) - E(c^\mu(\tau))$, the rotation between $E(c^\mu(\tau))$ and $E(c^\mu(\tau + \delta\tau))$ is given by

$$(E(c^\mu(\tau)) + \delta E(\tau))^{-1} E(c^\mu(\tau)) = 1 - E^{-1}(c^\mu(\tau)) \delta E(\tau) \quad (15)$$

where 1 is an identity matrix. Under that rotation, the spinor undergoes the transformation $\psi' = (1 - \frac{i}{4} \sigma^{\rho\sigma} (E^{-1}(c(\tau)) \delta E(\tau))_{\rho\sigma}) \psi$.

Now, we recall that we intend two real degrees of freedom associated with spin-up particle and spin-up antiparticle to come from two real scalar fields, while the other 6 degrees of freedom to come from rotations. We formally introduce eight unit vectors $\hat{\psi}_{u,p,r}, \hat{\psi}_{d,p,r}$,

$\hat{\psi}_{u,a,r}, \hat{\psi}_{d,a,r}, \hat{\psi}_{u,p,i}, \hat{\psi}_{d,p,i}, \hat{\psi}_{u,a,i}, \hat{\psi}_{d,a,i}$ where p and a stand for particle and antiparticle, u and d stand for spin-up and spin-down, and r and i stand for real and imaginary parts. We then define a spinor as

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\psi}(\chi_p(c^\mu(\tau)), \chi_a(c^\mu(\tau)), E(c^\mu(\tau))) &= \chi_p(c^\mu(\tau))\hat{\psi}_{u,p,r} + \chi_a(c^\mu(\tau))\hat{\psi}_{u,a,r} - \\ &- \frac{i}{4\delta\tau}\sigma^{\rho\sigma}(E^{-1}(c^\mu(\tau))\delta E(\tau))_{\rho\sigma}(\chi_p(c^\mu(\tau))\hat{\psi}_{u,p,r} + \chi_a(c^\mu(\tau))\hat{\psi}_{u,a,r}) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here, the first two terms on the right hand side corresponds to two degrees of freedom associated with real scalar fields, while the rest of the terms correspond to six rotation degrees of freedom. Since the variation is small, in order for all degrees of freedom to be "large" a factor of $1/\delta\tau$ is introduced.

In continuum form, $\delta E/\delta\tau$ is replaced with $\frac{dE(c^\mu(\tau))}{d\tau}$. Thus, the above expression becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\psi}(\chi_p(c^\mu(\tau)), \chi_a(c^\mu(\tau)), E(c^\mu(\tau))) &= \chi_p(c^\mu(\tau))\hat{\psi}_{u,p,r} + \chi_a(c^\mu(\tau))\hat{\psi}_{u,a,r} - \\ &- \frac{i}{4}\sigma^{\rho\sigma}\left(E^{-1}(c^\mu(\tau))\frac{dE(c^\mu(\tau))}{d\tau}\right)_{\rho\sigma}(\chi_p(c^\mu(\tau))\hat{\psi}_{u,p,r} + \chi_a(c^\mu(\tau))\hat{\psi}_{u,a,r}) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Finally, lets come back to Lagrangian. Let $\mathcal{L}_{old}$ be Lagrangian in standard quantum field theory books while $\mathcal{L}_{new}$ be the one proposed in this paper. They are related by

$$S_{new}(E, \chi_p, \chi_a) = S_{old}(E, \vec{\psi}(E, \chi_p, \chi_a)) \quad (18)$$

And finally the path integral is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\int [\mathcal{D}E][\mathcal{D}\chi_p][\mathcal{D}\chi_a] \left(\prod_{x,i} \xi(\psi_i(E(x), \chi_p(x), \chi_a(x))) \right) \times \\ &\times \left(\prod_{wedge} \hat{\psi}(x) \right) \cdot \exp_{wedge}(iS_{old}(E, \vec{\psi}(E, \chi_p, \chi_a))) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

While I was using $\hat{\psi}_i$, these are just constant unit vectors that have nothing to do with fields. After all, ψ_i are no longer independent variables. Nevertheless, it is possible to "formally" use constant unit vectors $\hat{\psi}_i$ while thinking of them as just $\hat{\theta}_n$ written differently.

4. Conclusion

While no new predictions are made, this paper is very important in answering some of the apparent paradoxes related to fermions. In particular, it was shown how to define Grassmann numbers outside of path integral, and it was also shown how to define both derivatives and integrals of Grassmann numbers in terms of analysis as opposed to algebra, thus bringing Grassmann numbers closer to the level of other mathematical objects.

It was also shown how to visualize spinors geometrically. This used to be a challenge due to the fact that spinors are subject to $SU(2)$ symmetry group, while things that are "visualizeable" geometrically are subject to $O(3)$ group. This issue is addressed by relaxing

the $SU(2)$ definition of a spinor by sticking to a fixed representation, namely the one in which all the imaginary as well as spin-down components of a spinor are zero. Then, the degrees of freedom I have just gotten rid of are restored by subjecting a spinor to rotation from vierbines at a given point to the ones at its neighbor, where "space filling curve" is used in defining the unique neighbor.

It is true that, by using a specific representation, it is still implied that a direction of e_3 is "better" than the direction of e_1 and e_2 . But since vierbines are now viewed as physical fields (namely degrees of freedom of fermionic field) there is nothing unusual about different fields behaving in different ways (or in particular e_3 -field behaving differently from e_1 and e_2 ones).

To be fair, in case of conventional quantum field theory, one can also claim that vierbines are fields. But doing so feels like cheating because, in light of symmetry, these fields play no physical role. On the other hand, in this paper, by getting rid of independent ψ field, the vierbines "steal" the physical significance from ψ . Thus, making an argument that appeals to vierbines being fields doesn't feel like cheating any more.

There are still some open questions. One such question is that vierbines are assumed to be orthonormal, which means that it is difficult to treat them as independent fields. One can still try to invent some artificial ways of making them orthonormal. One is Gramm Schmidt process (described in [2]) and the other involves Lagrange multipliers. Both, however, are very unnatural and non-linear.

Since it is not known how to perform path integrals of highly non-linear field behaviors, one is forced to continue to employ the ordinary formalism of quantum field theory while having on the back of the mind a more qualitative argument of why it is equivalent to the theory presented in this paper. This of course implies that the theory proposed here is just for one's philosophical satisfaction.

One also has to keep in mind that the philosophical satisfaction of the proposed theory comes with a price of having to view the Dirac symmetry group as merely coincidental, thus forfeiting a "beauty" one used to take for granted in ordinary quantum field theory. I, personally, feel that this price is well worth it since one can not visualize Dirac symmetry anyway. But it is up to a reader to decide whether that is worth it for them.

One open end of research is to try to introduce some specific space-filling curves as well as specific forms of discretization that would allow one to investigate path integrals. It would, in particular, be interesting to see whether the shape of space-filling curve will affect propagators on microscopic scale. However, from qualitative argument it is clear that the theory approximates the one we are used to on a large scale, where the shape of space filling curve is no longer important.

References

- [1] R Sverdlov 2008 “A geometrical description of spinor fields”,
`arXiv:0802.1914`.
- [2] R Sverdlov 2008 “Novel definition of Grassmann numbers and spinor fields”,
`arXiv:0808.0756`.